

## **REMARKS**

### 1. Present Status of Patent Application

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action of October 4, 2007. Claims 34 and 41-49 have been amended for clarification. Claims 28-48 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

### 2. Response to Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 28 and 30-34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Mastrianni* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0116641).

#### a. Claim 28

As provided in independent claim 28, Applicants claim:

A communication system comprising:  
a user interface application for an email service, the user interface application residing on a computer;  
a communication manager configured to:  
    track user activity; and  
    ***regulate a level of communications that occurs for an active user based upon a classification of the active user as either an adult or a child, the communication manager residing on the computer, wherein:  
the user interface application provides an identity of the active user to the communication manager such that a user interface is arranged according to settings for the active user such that a user having a child persona is restricted from configuring email accounts accessed by the communication manager for the active user having the child persona and a subset of operations performed by the communication manager unless authorized by a user having an adult persona.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 28 is allowable for at least the reason that *Mastrianni* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least to "regulate a level of communications that occurs for an active user based upon a classification of the active user as either an adult or a child, the communication manager residing on the

computer, wherein: the user interface application provides an identity of the active user to the communication manager such that a user interface is arranged according to settings for the active user such that a user having a child persona is restricted from configuring email accounts accessed by the communication manager for the active user having the child persona and a subset of operations performed by the communication manager unless authorized by a user having an adult persona,” as emphasized above.

In reviewing the reference, *Mastrianni* describes that a “parental or manager function allows e-mail to be scanned per user or globally on the system. This allows, for example, a parent to configure the e-mail system not to accept messages with the word ‘sex’ in them, or to delete all mail for a particular user.” Para. 0028. Therefore, *Mastrianni* discloses that criteria may be specified per user and not according to a user classification, such as an adult classification or a child classification. Further, *Mastrianni* does not disclose that a user interface is arranged in accordance with whether a user has a child persona. As such, *Mastrianni* fails to teach or suggest to “regulate a level of communications that occurs for an active user based upon a classification of the active user as either an adult or a child, the communication manager residing on the computer, wherein: the user interface application provides an identity of the active user to the communication manager such that a user interface is arranged according to settings for the active user such that a user having a child persona is restricted from configuring email accounts accessed by the communication manager for the active user having the child persona and a subset of operations performed by the communication manager unless authorized by a user having an adult persona,” as recited in claim 28.

Accordingly, claim 28 is not anticipated by *Mastrianni*, and the rejection of claim 35 should be withdrawn.

b. Claims 30-34

For at least the reasons given above, claim 28 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 30-34 depend from claim 28 and recite additional features, claims 30-34 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

3. Response to Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 29 and 35-48 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Mastrianni*. The Office Action states that the additional features recited in claims 29 and 35-48 are obvious in view of *Mastrianni*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

a. Claim 29

All of the claimed features of independent claim 28 are not taught and suggested by *Mastrianni*, as previously discussed. Since claim 29 depends from claim 28, claim 29 is allowable as a matter of law over the cited art.

b. Claim 35

As provided in independent claim 35, Applicants claim:

A method for providing child protection in communication services comprising:

tracking user activity on a computer;

***regulating a level of communications that occurs for an active user based upon a classification of the active user as either an adult or a child;***

***identifying the active user of the computer as either having a persona of a child type or an adult type;***

***arranging a user interface of the computer for an email service according to settings for the persona identified to be that of the active user; and***

***restricting a user having a child persona from configuring email accounts accessed by the computer for the active user having the child persona and performing a subset of operations associated with the user interface for the email service unless authorized by a user having an adult persona.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 35 is allowable for at least the reason that *Mastrianni* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "regulating a level of communications that occurs for an active user based upon a classification of the active user as either an adult or a child; identifying the active user of the computer as either having a persona of a child type or an adult type; arranging a user interface of the

computer for an email service according to settings for the persona identified to be that of the active user; and restricting a user having a child persona from configuring email accounts accessed by the computer for the active user having the child persona and performing a subset of operations associated with the user interface for the email service unless authorized by a user having an adult persona,” as emphasized above.

In reviewing the reference, *Mastrianni* describes that a “parental or manager function allows e-mail to be scanned per user or globally on the system. This allows, for example, a parent to configure the e-mail system not to accept messages with the word ‘sex’ in them, or to delete all mail for a particular user.” Para. 0028. Therefore, *Mastrianni* discloses that criteria may be specified per user and not according to a user classification, such as an adult classification or a child classification. Further, *Mastrianni* does not disclose that a user interface is arranged in accordance with whether a user has a child persona. As such, *Mastrianni* fails to teach or suggest “regulating a level of communications that occurs for an active user based upon a classification of the active user as either an adult or a child; identifying the active user of the computer as either having a persona of a child type or an adult type; arranging a user interface of the computer for an email service according to settings for the persona identified to be that of the active user; and restricting a user having a child persona from configuring email accounts accessed by the computer for the active user having the child persona and performing a subset of operations associated with the user interface for the email service unless authorized by a user having an adult persona,” as recited in claim 35.

Accordingly, claim 35 is not anticipated by *Mastrianni*, and the rejection of claim 35 should be withdrawn.

c. Claims 36-41

For at least the reasons given above, claim 35 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 36-41 depend from claim 35, claims 36-41 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

d. Claim 42

As provided in independent claim 423, Applicants claim:

A computer readable method encoded with a computer program for providing child protection in communication services when executed by a computer processor, the program comprising:

tracking user activity on a computer;

***regulating a level of communications that occurs for an active user based upon a classification of the active user as either an adult or a child;***

***identifying the active user of the computer as either having a persona of a child type or an adult type;***

***arranging a user interface of the computer for an email service according to settings for the persona identified to be that of the active user; and***

***restricting a user having a child persona from configuring email accounts accessed by the computer for the active user having the child persona and performing a subset of operations associated with the user interface for the email service unless authorized by a user having an adult persona.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 42 is allowable for at least the reason that *Mastrianni* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "regulating a level of communications that occurs for an active user based upon a classification of the active user as either an adult or a child; identifying the active user of the computer as either having a persona of a child type or an adult type; arranging a user interface of the computer for an email service according to settings for the persona identified to be that of the active user; and restricting a user having a child persona from configuring email accounts accessed by the computer for the active user having the child persona and performing a subset of operations associated with the user interface for the email service unless authorized by a user having an adult persona," as emphasized above.

In reviewing the reference, *Mastrianni* describes that a "parental or manager function allows e-mail to be scanned per user or globally on the system. This allows, for example, a parent to configure the e-mail system not to accept messages with the word 'sex' in them, or to delete all mail for a particular user." Para. 0028. Therefore, *Mastrianni* discloses that criteria may be specified per user and not according to a user classification, such as an adult classification or a child classification. Further, *Mastrianni*

does not disclose that a user interface is arranged in accordance with whether a user has a child persona. As such, *Mastrianni* fails to teach or suggest “regulating a level of communications that occurs for an active user based upon a classification of the active user as either an adult or a child; identifying the active user of the computer as either having a persona of a child type or an adult type; arranging a user interface of the computer for an email service according to settings for the persona identified to be that of the active user; and restricting a user having a child persona from configuring email accounts accessed by the computer for the active user having the child persona and performing a subset of operations associated with the user interface for the email service unless authorized by a user having an adult persona,” as recited in claim 42

Accordingly, claim 42 is not anticipated by *Mastrianni*, and the rejection of claim 42 should be withdrawn.

e. Claims 43-48

For at least the reasons given above, claim 42 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 43-48 depend from claim 42, claims 43-48 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

### **CONCLUSION**

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for at least the specific and particular reason that the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. In addition, Applicants reserve the right to address any comments made in the Office Action that were not specifically addressed herein. Thus, such comments should not be deemed admitted by the Applicants. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283**

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,  
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**  
Suite 1500  
600 Galleria Parkway N.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30339  
(770) 933-9500